

REMARKS

Objection to claim 9

The Examiner objected to claim 9 for an informality. The claim has been amended as suggested by the Examiner. Reconsideration of the examiner's objection to claim 9 is respectfully requested.

Rejection of claims 1-17 and 19-22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-17 and 19-22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Terzian. Applicant traverses the Examiner's finding of anticipation of the claims as amended. Terzian teaches a swap scan register that can exchange the contents of an operational register and a test register. Applicant believes the cited art does not teach or suggest the claimed invention as amended herein.

Claims 1-8

Claims 1-8 were cancelled.

Claim 9

After discussion with the Examiner, claim 9 was amended to remove the possible interpretation of the claim that only one of the plurality of latches could be connected to the primary latch. Claim 9 was amended to more clearly show that each of the secondary latches is connected to the primary latch and the context switch mechanism can switch the contents of any one of the secondary latches with the primary latch. The Examiner rejected claim 9 citing Terzian for the claim limitation of "a context switch mechanism ... that causes the data on the data output of the selected one secondary latch to be written to

the primary latch” (col. 1, line 64 - col. 2, line 57, Operational data, 16b, OP REG 0 and OP REG 1, are swapped with test data, 18b, OP REG 1 and OP REG 1 respectively).

Terzian teaches that the contents of the operational registers are swapped with the contents of the test registers. Terzian does not teach or suggest a plurality of secondary latches for each primary latch, and that each of the secondary latches can be written to the primary latch. In Terzian, the latches are in pairs. The latches are always swapped with their counterpart of the matching pair. Terzian does not teach or suggest a plurality of secondary latches and a data selection mechanism that selects one data output from the plurality of secondary latches to feed back to the primary latch as recited in claim 9. For this reason, claim 9 is allowable, and Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Claims 10-15

Claims 10-15 depend on claim 9, which is allowable for the reasons given above. As a result, claims 10-15 are allowable as depending on allowable independent claims.

Claim 16-20

Claims 16-20 were cancelled.

Claim 21

Claim 21 includes limitations similar to claim 9 discussed above. The discussion above for claim 9 is included here by reference. Terzian does not teach or suggest a plurality of secondary latches and selecting one of the plurality of secondary latches for performing a context switch with the primary latch, as recited in claim 9. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Claim 22

Claim 22 depends on claim 21, which is allowable for the reasons given above. As a result, claim 22 is allowable as depending on an allowable independent claim.

Conclusion

In summary, none of the cited prior art, either alone or in combination, teach, support, or suggest the unique combination of features in applicant's claims presently on file. Therefore, applicant respectfully asserts that all of applicant's claims are allowable. Such allowance at an early date is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if this would in any way advance the prosecution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,

By /bretjpetersen/
Bret J. Petersen
Reg. No. 37,417

MARTIN & ASSOCIATES, L.L.C.
P.O. Box 548
Carthage, MO 64836-0548
(417) 358-4700